BEST AVAILABLE COPY

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

(PCT Article 18 and Rules 43 and 44)

Applicant's or agent's file reference	FOR FURTHER ACTION as well		see Form PCT/ISA/220 well as, where applicable, Item 5 below.	
PDS-016-PCT				
International application No.	international filing date (day/mont	Vyear)	(Earliest) Priority Date (day/month/year)	
PCT/IL2004/000254	18/03/2004		26/01/2004	
Applicant				
			·	
POWERDSINE, LTD.				
	_			
This international Search Report has been according to Article 18. A copy is being tra	prepared by this international Sear Insmitted to the international Bureau	iching Auth J.	ority and is transmitted to the applicant	
This International Search Report consists	of a total of4 she	vote		
	a copy of each prior art document o		report.	
	•		•	
Basis of the report With recent to the language the in	tua batrea seu darens (sanitentata	on the hor	ils of the international application in the	
language in which it was filed, unle	ess otherwise indicated under this it	em.	is of the international application in the	
The international s	earch was carried out on the basis	of a transia	ation of the international application furnished to	
this Authority (Ruk	, ,,	diadagad	in the international application, see Box No. i.	
	nan ailman anusia anto sodonina	WISCOSSU!	и пе шелатоны арркавол, зее вох д о.).	
2. Certain claims were foun	d unsearchable (See Box II).			
3. Unity of invention is lack	ing (see Box III).		•	
4. With regard to the title,			,	
X the text is approved as sub	mitted by the applicant.			
	ed by this Authority to read as tollo	w8:		
			•	
 With regard to the abatract, 	•			
the text is approved as sub				
the text has been established may, within one month from	ed, according to Rule 38.2(b), by the the date of mailing of this internation.	s Authority	r as it appears in Box No. IV. The applicant in report, submit comments to this Authority.	
	·			
With regards to the drawings,				
a. the figure of the drawings to be pu		lo. <u>2a</u>	·	
X as suggested by the			`	
	Authority, because the applicant fall			
b. none of the figures is to be	Authority, because this figure better published with the abstract	cnaracter	zes the invention.	
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

Form PCT/ISA/210 (first sheet) (January 2004)

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International Application No PCT/IL2004/000254

A. CLASSIFICATION OF SUBJECT MATTER
IPC 7 H04L12/10 H02J1/10 H02J1/14 According to International Patent Classification (IPC) or to both national classification and IPC B. FIELDS SEARCHED Minimum documentation searched (classification system followed by classification symbols) HO4L HO2J IPC 7 Documentation searched other than minimum documentation to the extent that such documents are included in the fields searched Electronic data base consulted during the international search (name of data base and, where practical search terms used) EPO-Internal, WPI Data C. DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages Relevant to claim No. US 6 473 608 B1 (KORCHARZ DROR ET AL) 1-7, 41-47 29 October 2002 (2002-10-29) A abstract 8-40,49 column 5, line 6 - line 28 column 13, line 64 - column 14, line 13 column 19, line 39 - line 42 column 32, line 29 - column 38, line 1 column 35, line 13 - column 38, line 1; claims 1,2; figures 1A,15A-19C Y US 2003/168913 A1 (KINNARD J R) 1-7, 11 September 2003 (2003-09-11) 41-47 paragraphs '0018!, '0019!; claims 1,2,4; figure 4 Further documents are listed in the continuation of box C. Patent family members are fisted in annex. Special categories of cited documents ; "T" later document published after the international filing date or priority date and not in conflict with the application but cited to understand the principle or theory underlying the *A* document defining the general state of the art which is not considered to be of perticular relevance *E* earlier document but published on or after the international filing date "X" document of particular retevence; the claimed Invention cannot be considered hovel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is taken alone "L" document which may throw doubts on priority claim(s) or which is cited to establish the publication date of another citation or other special reason (as specified) "Y" document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is combined with one or more other such documents, such combination being obvious to a person sidiled in the art, "O" document referring to an onal disclosure, use, exhibition or Other means document published prior to the international filing date but later than the priority date claimed "&" document member of the same patent family Date of the actual completion of the international search Date of mailing of the international search report 27 September 2004 11/10/2004 Name and mailing address of the ISA Authorized officer European Patent Office, P.B. 5818 Patentiaan 2 NL - 2280 HV Rijswijk Tel (+31-70) 340-2040, Tx. 31 651 epo ni, Fax: (+31-70) 340-3016 Jimenez Hernandez, P

Form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet) (January 2004)

2

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International Application No
PCT/IL2004/000254

(Continue	INION) DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT	
ategory *		Relevant to claim No.
	US 2001/024109 A1 (SOBKOW MARK ET AL) 27 September 2001 (2001-09-27) abstract paragraph '0003! - paragraph '0007!; claims 1-3; figure 1 column 11, line 5 - column 11, line 17; claims 1,2,4; figures 1,6A	41,42
١	US 6 438 007 B1 (WILDRICK CARL M ET AL) 20 August 2002 (2002-08-20) the Whole document	41,42
	US 6 125 448 A (SCHWAN MARTIN A K ET AL) 26 September 2000 (2000-09-26) the whole document	1-49
	·	

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

Information on patent family members

International Application No PCT/IL2004/000254

Patent document cited in search report		Publication date	Patent family member(s)			Publication date	
US	6473608	B1	29-10-2002	US	6643566	B1	04-11-2003
-				AU	763004	B2	10-07-2003
				ΑU	1678500	A	01-08-2000
				CA	2363831	A1	20-07-2000
				CN	1333963		30-01-2002
				EP	1145494		17-10-2001
	•			MO	0041496		20-07-2000
				JP	2002534937		15-10-2002
				NZ	513486		30-06-2003
			•	US	2003036819		20-02-2003
				US	2002191553		19-12-2002
				US	2003099076		29-05-2003
	•			US US	2004037300		26-02-2004
				US US	2004049321		11-03-2004
				US	2004095933 2004095917		20-05-2004 20-05-2004
				ZA	200106533		08-08-2002
							00-00-2002
US	2003168913	A1	11-09-2003	GB	2390238	A ,B	31-12-2003
US	2001024109	Al	27-09-2001	NONE			
us	6438007	B1	20-08-2002	NONE			

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

Yo:	:				PCT
	see form	PCT/ISA/220		INTERNATIO	TEN OPINION OF THE NAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY PCT Ruie 43 <i>bis</i> .1)
				Date of mailing (day/month/year) se	ee form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)
	licant's or agent's file form PCT/ISA/2			FOR FURTHER See paragraph 2 bel	
	mational application T/IL2004/000254		International filing date (c	day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year) 26.01.2004
	mational Patent Class 4L12/10, H02J1/1		ooth national classification	and IPC	
	ficant WERDSINE, LTI	D.			
1.	Box No. I Box No. II Box No. IV Box No. V Box No. V Box No. VI Box No. VI Box No. VIII Box No. VIII	Basis of the op Priority Non-establishm Lack of unity of Reasoned state applicability; cit Certain docume Certain defects Certain observa	eent of opinion with rega invention ement under Rule 43 <i>bis</i> ations and explanations	ard to novelty, inventi I (a)(i) with regard to supporting such stat	ve step and industrial applicability novelty, inventive step or industrial tement
2 .	the applicant che International Bur will not be so cor If this opinion is, submit to the IPE	nternational prelifications on the international poses an Authorities under Rule the insidered. as provided about a written reply date of mailing of the international provided as written reply date of mailing of the international provided as written reply date of mailing of the international provided as written reply date of mailing of the international provided as written reply date of mailing of the international prelimited in the internat	! Preliminary Examining y other than this one to 66.1 <i>bis</i> (b) that written op we, considered to be a w together, where append	Authority ("IPEA"). In being the IPEA and the plants of this internation of the lighter with amendments.	I usually be considered to be a However, this does not apply where chosen IPEA has notifed the stional Searching Authority IPEA, the applicant is invited to ents, before the expiration of three of 22 months from the priority date,
_	For further option				
3.	For further details	s, see notes to F	om PCT/ISA/220.		



European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Jimenez Hernandez, P Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7938



WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/IL2004/000254

_	Ro	x No.	I Basis of the opinion				
1.	Wit the	h reg langi	ard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in uage in which it was field, unless otherwise indicated under this item.				
		lang	opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following juage , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search fer Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).				
2.	Wit	h reg :essa	ard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and ry to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:				
	a. t	ype o	f material:				
	ŧ	⊐ 8	sequence listing				
		⊃ ta	able(s) related to the sequence listing				
	b. fo	format of material:					
	. [j ir	written format				
	0	⊃ ir	computer readable form				
	c. ti	me o	f filing/furnishing:				
	E	□ c	ontained in the international application as filed.				
] fi	led together with the international application in computer readable form.				
	C) fi	urnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.				
3.		copie	Idition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional es is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as oppriate, were furnished.				
4.	Add	itiona	I comments:				

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/IL2004/000254

_	Par	k No. II	Priority					
					- 6			
١.	Ø	ine ioi	lowing document h	as not bee	mumsne	a.		
		☒	copy of the earlier	applicatio	n whose p	priority has been claimed (Rule 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 66.7(a)).		
			translation of the e	arlier app	lication wh	nose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(b)).		
		Conser neverth	quently it has not be reless been establis	en possit shed on th	ole to cons le assumpt	ider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has tion that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.		
2.		has be	oinion has been est en found invalid (Ri ate indicated above	ıles 43 <i>bis</i>	.1 and 64.1	ority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority clain 1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international the relevant date.		
3.	Add	Additional observations, if necessary:						
_			* ,					
		c No. V ustrial #	Reasoned state applicability; citati	ment und ons and d	er Rule 43 explanatio	3bls.1(a)(I) with regard to novelty, inventive step or one supporting such statement		
1.		tement						
	Nov	elty (N)		Yes	Claims	1-49		
		, (,		No:	Claims			
	Inve	entiv e st	ep (IS)	Yes:	Claims	8-40,49		
				No:	Claims	1-7,41-48		
	Indu	ıstrial ap	oplicability (IA)	Yes:	Claims	1-49		
		•		No:	Claims			
2.	Cita	tions an	d explanations					
	ŝeė	Separa	te sheet			•		
		. 51 - 140						
_		No. VII		·				
Th	e foli	owing d	efects in the form-o	r contents	of the inte	ernational application have been noted:		
	500	separa	te sheet					
	Box	No. VII	Certain observ	ations on	the intern	national application		
_						Apprount		

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

see separate sheet

Re Item V

Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

- 1. The following documents are referred to in this communication; the numbering will be adhered to in the rest of the procedure:
 - D1: US-B-6 473 6081 (KORCHARZ DROR ET AL) 29 October 2002 (2002-10-29)
 - D2: US 2003/168913 A1 (KINNARD J R) 11 September 2003 (2003-09-11)
 - D3: US 2001/024109 A1 (SOBKOW MARK ET AL) 27 September 2001 (2001-09-27)
 - D4: US-B-6 438 0071 (WILDRICK CARL M ET AL) 20 August 2002 (2002-08-20)
- 2. The subject-matter of claim 41, which is the broadest claim, does not involve an inventive step as far as it can be interpreted, see also Item VIII. Claim 41 therefore does not meet the requirements of Art. 33 (3) PCT:
- 2.1 Closest prior art document D1 discloses, in the terminology of claim 1, a method of supplying additional power to a module [having a load therein] having an internal power supply (abstract), the method comprising:
 - supplying a first power to the load [by the internal power supply] (col. 31, lines 58-61, fig. 15, 2512); and
 - supplying a variable current limited power to said load (col. 31, lines 52-55, fig. 15, 2506, col. 13, lines 64-67, claim 2),
 - whereby said variable current limited power is fed to said load and said [first] power is fed [by said internal power supply] (fig. 15).
- 2.2 Claim 1 differs from D1 only in that the power needs of the load are in excess of the power supplied by the current limited power source, so that power is supplied to the load in parallel by the two power supplies.
- 2.3 The objective problem starting from D1 is how to supply power to modules whose power needs exceed, either temporarily or not, the capability of their internal power supply when the internal power supply still can supply some power. The normal case accounted for in the disclosure of D1 is the use of the external

power when the internal power supply becomes fully disrupted. However, D1 also acknowledges implicitly the problem of combining power in parallel from these two power sources, since it teaches how to provide "at least some operating power" to modules, which hints at that direction (abstract). Therefore, should some but insufficient internal power be available, it is a straightforward measure for the skilled person, starting from D1, to operate both power sources in parallel, e.g. following the teachings of D2, abstract, Fig. 4, thus arriving at the subject-matter of D1.

3. The subject-matter of claim 1 does not involve an inventive step as far as it can be interpreted, see also Item VIII. Claim 1 therefore does not meet the requirements of Art. 33 (3) PCT:

Claim 1 claims a system corresponding to the method in claim 41 and further adding the use of a controller whose output varies the current limit of the variable current limited power supply. Since this feature is known from D1 (see col. 5, lines 10-28, col. 36, lines 45-49, claim 2, fig. 19c), the reasoning in the previous point also applies to the subject-matter of claim 1.

4. The subject-matter of claim 43 does not involve an inventive step as far as it can be interpreted, see also item VIII. Claim 43 therefore does not meet the requirements of Art. 33 (3) PCT:

Claim 43 only adds some common variation features to the system defined in claim 1: the use of boost converters and the provision of equal voltage output by the first (external) power supply in the case of failure of the second (internal) power supply. In particular, the aspect of internal power supply failure and backup functionality over the external power supply is well documented in D1. Therefore, these are all either already disclosed/easily derivable features from the disclosure of closest prior art document D1 or common measures that the skilled person would apply when following the teachings of D1, thus not deserving any inventive skills. The reasoning in point 2 also applies to claim 43.

5. The additional features of the dependent claims 2-7, 42, 44-48 do not add anything inventive to the independent claims because these features are either known from the prior art (varying the current limit in claim 42: see citations in point 3) or common measures or variations (Article 33(3) PCT).

- 6. The subject-matter of claims 18 meets the requirements of novelty and inventive step (Art. 33(1)-(3) PCT):
- 6.1 Claim 1 relates to a system for supplying additional power to a module having an internal power supply. D1 also discloses a system of the same type, see point 2.
- 6.2 Claim 1 is distinguished from **D1** in that the current limited power source and the associated (internal) power source operate in parallel and in that the current limited power source is responsive to an input from a controller to vary the current limit of the power source, whereby the controller varies the current limit in response to information regarding at least one of said load and said power supply associated with said load.
- 6.3 The objective problem starting from **D1** is how to supply power to modules whose power needs exceed the capability of their internal power supply when their internal power supply is operative without having to re-engineer the existing internal power supply modules. This problem is solved by the distinguishing features in the previous point.
- 6.4 None of remaining documents cited in the Search Report disclose or suggest such a solution. Therefore an inventive step must be acknowledged.
- 7. The subject-matter of claims 34 meets the requirements of novelty and inventive step (Art. 33(1)-(3) PCT):

Claim 34 claims a method corresponding to the system in claim 18, whose apparatus features are characterised by carrying out the method steps in claim 34. Therefore, the reasoning in point 6 also applies to claim 34.

Re Item VII

Certain defects in the international application

- 1. The claims do not contain reference signs in parentheses, Rule 6.2(b) PCT.
- 2. The independent claims are not in the two-part form vis-à-vis D1, Rule 6.3(b) PCT.

- 3. **D1-D4** are not mentioned in the description, Rule 5.1(a)(ii) PCT. D3 and D4 are also considered to be very relevant to the subject-matter of the application.
- 4. The phrase "incorporated by reference in their entirety" on page 1 should be deleted as the application should be self-contained; such referenced documents are not regarded as part of the disclosure unless they contain matter essential to the invention, in which case the subject-matter in question would have to be incorporated into the description. This however is not the case here (see PCT International Preliminary Examination Guidelines II-4.17).

Re Item VIII

Certain observations on the International application (Art. 6 PCT, clarity)

- 1. The independent claims are not allowable due to severe lack of clarity issues:
- 1.1 Claim 1 claims "a system for supplying additional power to a module", ie a first system arranged for or suitable to interact (provide power) with a second system. However, the features defined to be comprised in this system also include the module itself, eg. the first system arranged for or suitable to interact with a second system in lines 4,5 is at the same time defined to comprise the second system in its definition. This causes a severe lack of clarity and consistency in the definition of the subject-matter and of the scope of protection. The same applies to claim 18.
- 1.2 The expression "not being designed to accommodate power sharing" in claim 1, lines 6, 7 and "not designed to accommodate power sharing" in claim 34 are not clear since they try to define some ambiguous technical feature as a disclaimer definition. The module is indeed defined in the claims so as to accommodate power sharing, so that this disclaimer definition only causes uncertainty as to the technical features meant by it and does not have a restrictive effect, i.e. it does not limit the scope of protection.
- 1.3 The expressions "variable current limited power source" and "variable current limited power supply" in the independent claims are unclear.
- 1.4 Method claim 34 is defined by pseudo-method steps which are not clear regarding category: eg "supplying a load", "supplying a power supply", etc. which are

structural (apparatus) features rather than method steps.

- 1.5 The term "first power" in claim 41, lines 9 and 13 is unclear: on line 9, it seems to relate to power in the sense of electrical energy. On line 9, even if formally referring to the antecedent, this expression seems to relate to a power supply or power source apparatus entity.
 - Furthermore, the location and scope of the term "module" in this claim is also unclear (what parts does it comprise? how does it relate to the other parts and/or method steps?).
- 2. The claims should have defined the relevant subject-matter in terms of a single independent claim in each category followed by dependent claims covering features which are merely optional (conciseness, Art. 6 PCT and Rule 6.4 PCT). Although claims 1, 18 and 43 in the apparatus category and claims 34 and 41 in the method category have been drafted as separate independent claims, they appear to be easily re-draftable as a single independent claim in each category with additional dependent claims. The aforementioned claims therefore lack conciseness. Moreover, lack of clarity of the claims as a whole arises, since the plurality of independent claims makes it difficult to determine the matter for which protection is sought, and places an undue burden on others seeking to establish the extent of the protection. A single independent claim in each category appears in this case appropriate.

Furthermore, the claims are not concise since in some cases the same subjectmatter is substantially defined by both an independent claim and certain dependent claim depending on a broader independent claim.

Hence, claims 1, 18, 34, 41 and 43 do not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT.

3. The drawing sheets relating to Fig. 5a, 5b, 5c, 5d and 6 referred to in the description are missing. The application should have been adapted accordingly.

This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning Operations and is not part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:
☐ BLACK BORDERS
☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
☐ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
☐ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
☐ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY
D other.

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.